



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ST  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,504	10/19/2001	Steven J. Siegel	PENN-0789	3358
7590	08/25/2005		EXAMINER	
Licata & Tyrrell P.C. 66 E. Main Street Marlton, NJ 08053			FUBARA, BLESSING M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b><i>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/046,504	SIEGEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Blessing M. Fubara	1618	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-10.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: There appears not to be any structural difference between the claimed composition that consists essentially of biodegradable polymer or copolymer and haloperidol and the prior art composition, which is also a combination of haloperidol and biodegradable polymer. While the intended use of the present invention as acknowledged by applicants is indicated in applicants' specification as being fabricated for surgical implantation, it is respectfully noted that there is really no structural limitation of the claimed composition that sets it apart from the composition of the prior art that is made up of haloperidol and lactic acid/glycolic acid. The lactide and glycolide are recited in instant claim 2. Furthermore, Kino recognizes and discloses that the composition can be surgically implanted, but avoided. The same is true for the Cheng reference. In the case of Brodbeck, the Brodbeck reference specifically discloses implantation as presented in the last office action. An implanted composition can be removed or left in place. A surgically implanted formulation can also be surgically removed except there is evidence that the surgically implantable haloperidol-poly (lactide-co-glycolide copolymer) of Brodbeck cannot be surgically removed. Implantable is a route of administering the composition and thus the prior art disclosing the same composition as the claimed composition does not have to specifically state implantable and as such the rejection of claims 4-10 over Cheng is proper. Regarding Brodbeck and claims 7-10, it is noted as above and in the Office actions that there appears not to be structural difference between the claimed composition and that of Brodbeck.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). James M. Spear

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*James M. Spear*  
JAMES M. SPEAR

PRIMARY EXAMINER

*AK 16 18*

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/046,504	SIEGEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Blessing M. Fubara	1618	

*James M. Spear*  
JAMES M. SPEAR  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
AU 1618